APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,519	07/01/2003	Vadim Fux	555255012436	4435

33070   7590   03/05/2009

JOSEPH M. SAUER
JONES DAY REAVIS & POGUE
NORTH POINT, 901 LAKESIDE AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/611,519	FUX ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SIMON KE	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 November 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *18-33* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *18-33* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/10/08 has been entered.

Claims 18-33 are pending in this application. Claims 18 and 30 are independent claims.

In the Amendment, filed on 12/10/08, claims 18 and 30 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-22, 26-27, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Balakrishan 5,952,942 in view of Monghanni 5,675,817 further in view Kang

US Patent 7,168,046.

As per claim 18, Balakrishnan (US 5,952,942) teaches a mobile device, comprising:

a text input device; (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: line 1 -figure 1, col. 3,

lines 20-45)

a graphical user interface (GUI) that includes a plurality of input fields for receiving input

for a device application, wherein the GUI is configured to enable a user to select a particular

input field from the plurality of input fields to enter a textual input using the text input device;

(see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: figure 1, col. 3, lines 20-45)

a plurality of mapping tables for translating textual inputs from the text input device into

alphanumeric characters, wherein each of the plurality of mapping tables; (see Balakrishnan col.

1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70 col. 9, lines 42-70) and

a text input handler that receives the textual input and selects one of the mapping tables to

translate the textual input into one or more alphanumeric characters of a particular output for

display on the GUI, wherein the one mapping table is selected based on the particular input field

selected by the user to enter the textual input; (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: col.

8, lines 40-70)

whereby a keystroke on the text input device may result in a different output being

displayed on the GUI depending on which of the plurality of input fields is selected by the user

to receive the input. (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70)

However, Balakrishnan does not specifically teaches translates into alphanumeric

characters of a different language.

Monghanni teaches translates into alphanumeric characters of a different language. (see

Monghanni, col. 1-col. 8; specifically: col. 3, lines 25, lines 50)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Monghanni's teaching with method of Balakrishnan in order to provide user with the ability to input in multiple languages.

However, they fail to teach automatically selected by text input based which of the plurality of mapping tables has been pre-defined for the particular filed; and where in at least of the simultaneously displayed input fields have different pre-defined mapping tables and plurality of input fields are simultaneously displayed.

Kang (7,168,046) teaches automatically selected by text input based which of the plurality of mapping tables has been pre-defined for the particular filed; and where in at least of the simultaneously displayed input fields have different pre-defined mapping tables and plurality of input fields are simultaneously displayed. (see Kang, fig. 4, fig. 6-9, col. 4, lines 40-col. 6, lines 7)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kang's teaching with method of Balakrishnan and Monghanni in order to make entering operations for all fields less tedious and time consuming.

As per claim 19, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 18. Balakrishnan further teaches the device comprising:

a plurality of input methods that are used to predict a complete word or phrase from a partial input, each of the plurality of input methods being specific to a different language, wherein one of the plurality of input methods is selected based on the particular input field

selected by the user to enter the textual input and is used to predict a word or phrase from the textual input. (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: figure 4, items 120-200)

As per claim 20, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 19. Balakrishan teaches wherein the one input method accesses a word list associated with the device application to predict the complete word or phrase. (Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: figure 4, items 120-200);

As per claim 21, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 18. Monghanni further teaches comprising:

a translation module that translates the textual input into an index value, and wherein the text input handler translates the index value into one or more alphanumeric characters of a particular language for display on the GUI. (see Monghanni, col. 1-col. 8; specifically: figure 7 col. 6, lines 1-31)

As per claim 22, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 21. Monghanni teaches wherein the translation module translates the textual input into see Monghanni, col. 1-col. 8; specifically: figure 7 col. 6, lines 1-31) a platform-independent event that includes the index value along with additional event data. (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70)

As per claim 26, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 18, wherein the text input device is a telephone-style keypad. (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70)

As per claim 27, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 18. Balakrishna further teaches wherein the text input device is a keyboard. (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70)

As per claim 30, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach a method of processing a textual input on a mobile device, comprising:

receiving a user input to select an input field from a plurality of input fields on a graphical user interface (GUI); (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: line 1 -figure 1, col. 3, lines 20-45)

receiving a textual input from a text input device; (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: line 1 -figure 1, col. 3, lines 20-45)

translating the textual input into one or more alphanumeric characters of a particular output, wherein the particular output is one of a plurality of output available on the mobile device and is selected from the plurality of available output based on the input field on the GU! selected by the user input; (see Balakrishnan col. 1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70 col. 9, lines 42-70) and

displaying the alphanumeric characters in the input field; wherein a keystroke on the text

input device may result in a different output being displayed on the GUI depending on which of

the plurality of input fields is selected by the user to receive the textual input. (see Balakrishnan

col. 1- col.14; specifically: col. 8, lines 40-70)

However, Balakrishnan does not specifically teaches translates into alphanumeric

characters of a different language.

Monghanni teaches translates into alphanumeric characters of a different language. (see

Monghanni, col. 1-col. 8; specifically: col. 3, lines 25, lines 50)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include

Monghanni's teaching with method of Balakrishnan. in order to provide user with the ability to

input in multiple languages.

However, they fail to teach automatically selected by text input based which of the

plurality of mapping tables has been pre-defined for the particular filed; and where in at least of

the simultaneously displayed input fields have different pre-defined mapping tables and plurality

of input fields are simultaneously displayed.

Kang (7,168,046) teaches automatically selected by text input based which of the

plurality of mapping tables has been pre-defined for the particular filed; and where in at least of

the simultaneously displayed input fields have different pre-defined mapping tables and plurality

of input fields are simultaneously displayed. (see Kang, fig. 4, fig. 6-9, col. 4, lines 40-col. 6,

lines 7)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kang's

teaching with method of Balakrishnan and Monghanni in order to make entering operations for

all fields less tedious and time consuming.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 30, it is rejected under the same rational as

claim 19. Supra.

As per claim 32, Balakrishnan, Monghanni and Kang teach the method of claim 31.

Balakrishnan further teaches comprising:

using the selected input method to predict a word or phrase from the textual input; and

displaying the predicted word or phrase in the input field. (see Monghanni, col. 1-col. 8;

specifically: col. 6, lines 1-15)

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 30, it is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 21. Supra.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishan

5,952,942 in view of Monghanni 5,675,817 further in view of Veres US Publication

2007/0112643 further in view of Harel US Patent 6,384,843.

As per claim 23, Balakrishan, Monghanni, and Veres teach the mobile device of claim

22. However, they fail to teach wherein the additional event data indicates a time that the textual

input was entered.

Harel teaches the additional event data indicates a time that the textual input was entered. (see Harel; col. 7, lines 53-61)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Harel's teaching with method of Balakrishnan and Monghanni in order to provide user with a usability problem identifier.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishan 5,952,942 in view of Monghanni 5,675,817 further in view of Kang US Patent 7,168,046 further in view of Ni US Patent 6,822,585.

As per claim 24, Balakrishan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 22. However, they fail to teach wherein the additional event data indicates a number of times that a keystroke was repeated.

Ni teaches wherein the additional event data indicates a number of times that a keystroke was repeated. (figure 1, candidate list, column 2, lines 60-70; As well as figure 7, column 9 lines 35-column 10 lines 40)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ni's teaching with method of Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang in order to provide user with the ability to repeat entries.

As per claim 25, Balakrishan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 22. They fail to teach wherein the additional event data indicates a state of the text input device.

Ni teaches wherein the additional event data indicates a state of the text input device. (column 7, lines 10-25, status indicator is a event data)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ni's teaching with method of Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang in order to provide user with a state indicator.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishan 5,952,942 in view of Monghanni 5,675,817 further in view of Kang US Patent 7,168,046 further in view of Kushler US Patent 6,646,573.

As per claim 28, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 18. They fail to teach wherein the text input device is a virtual keyboard on a touch screen interface.

Kushler teaches the input device is a virtual keyboard on a touch screen user interface. (column 12, lines 35-42)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kushler's teaching with method of Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang in order to reduce user's reliance on regular keyboard.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishan 5,952,942 in view of Monghanni 5,675,817 further in view of Kang US Patent 7,168,046 further in view of Yu US Patent 6,271,865.

As per claim 29, Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang teach the mobile device of claim 19. They fail to teach further comprising:

a loading and unloading mechanism configured to remove one or more of the input methods from the mobile device and add one or more additional input methods to the mobile device.

Yu teaches loading and unloading mechanism operable to remove one or more of the input methods from the mobile device and add one or more additional input methods to the mobile device. (column 2, lines 30-56)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Yu's teaching with method of Balakrishnan, Monghanni, and Kang in order to provide user with more character options.

Response To Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke
/Peng Ke/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174